



Interview Summary

 Application No.
08/367,370

Applicant(s)

Rimsa et al.

Examiner

Jeffrey Mullis

Group Art Unit

1207



Participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

 (1) Jeffrey Mullis (examiner)

(3) _____

 (2) Eugene Zagarella (applicants' Attorney)

(4) _____

 Date of Interview Jan 7, 1997

 Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

 Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

 Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

 Claim(s) discussed: 78-85

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' attorney was contacted and it was suggested by the examiner that narrower claims which would otherwise corresponded to claims 78-85 but for which there was support for their full breadth and which were allowable over the prior art be submitted. In particular, it was suggested that a new claim be submitted in which claim 78 was amended by changing "about 1.0 to about 2.5" at line 3 to --about 1.0 to 2.5--; to eliminate "hydrophobic...amorphous" in line 2; eliminating "bacterial and synthetic" in line 5 and changing "poly(beta-hydroxyalkanoates)(PHA)" in line 5 to --poly(beta-hydroxypropionate)--. Applicants' attorney was also told to submit new claims dependent on claim 86 which would correspond to claims 79-85 and which were amended similarly to claim 78 where needed. Applicants' attorney was told that aside from the limitations in new claim 86 and the extraneous periods in claims 80 and 81, the only changes to the dependent claims would be to eliminate "aliphatic biodegradable polyesters" from the last line of claim 79. Applicants'

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

01/07/97 TUE 13:42 FAX 3055432

USPTO GROUP1500

001

US Patent & Trademark
Office

Group 1200

FAX

Date: _____

Number of pages including cover sheet: _____

To:

Eugene Zagarella

Phone: _____

Fax phone: _____

CC: _____

From:

Ext. J. Mullis
~~Joyce Bridges, secretary~~

Phone:

³⁰⁸⁻²⁸²⁰
(703) 305-5489

Fax phone:

(703) 308-4734

REMARKS:

☐ Urgent



For your review



Reply ASAP



Please comment